



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/841,950 04/08/97 RIGGINS M 40827.00004

LM02/0508

MARC A SOCKOL
GRAHAM & JAMES LLP
600 HANSEN WAY
PALO ALTO CA 94304-1043

EXAMINER

LAUFER, P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2766

DATE MAILED:

05/08/00

21

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/841,950

Applicant(s)

Mark D. Riggins

Examiner 703308 v160
Pinchus M. LauferGroup Art Unit
2766

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 Feb 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 16 & 20

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Part III DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Continued Prosecution Application

2. The request filed on 28 February 2000 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 08/841,950 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

35 U.S.C. § 101

3. The rejections of Claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are withdrawn. The claims now recite a "specific machine or manufacture" as per the Guidelines.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2-10 and 13: Based on Applicant's representation that the claim language is designed to include structure (additional software or appropriate hardware) the rejection is withdrawn. However, the Examiner strongly encourages Applicant to find a clearer way of claiming so as to avoid this confusion.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

4. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Vogler ('683) in view of Netscape version 2. Vogler teaches a system which controls access to a service through downloading of an access connect applet to a prospective client after authentication. Vogler does not teach the use of a key safe that stores a key which enables access to the service. However, Vogler [3:33-36] teaches that the access connect applet may gather authentication information, where the "type and extent of client information collected are application dependent". In light of this teaching it would have been obvious to employ Vogler's access facilitator with home banking systems, Internet shopping, and the like employing a standard browser such as Netscape on the client side. Such an implementation would include a piece of secret information to control access (i.e., a key) and could entail any or all the standard security techniques used in on-line commerce.

Applicant has amended the independent claims to recite a web server for enabling the client to select from a set of available services ... and amended the "key safe" to store keys where each key enables communication between the client and a respective service. Vogler deals with a single service. The examiner takes Official notice that web sites linking to multiple services are ubiquitous and as such the mere multiplicity of services to link to would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Note that Netscape supports SSL and public key certificates. (ElGamal ('390) is supplied as a reference to SSL.) With respect to negotiating a protocol (claims 3 and 17), SSL negotiates which algorithm to use for the session encryption. With respect to claims 10-11 and 24-25, the term "firewall" is broadly used to describe any internetwork security scheme, therefore both the secured

Serial Number: 08/841,950
Art Unit: 2766

- 3 -

service, and the global server (identified with the access facilitator) have firewalls. With respect to claims 7 and 21, the certificate provided by the client which is signed by a trusted authority is understood as a "global" certificate since it is available to all by virtue of the trusted authority public key.

Note further, that many systems present different views to users authenticated at different levels of trust or at different categories of service ("client privileges). For example, standard SQL or Oracle databases are designed to allow different functions to different classes of user. Lexis/Nexis and ProQuest Direct are two examples of services where the authenticated user has a profile indicating allowed services and the linking to the services is done by the central server without the user needing to enter further authentication information at the new (ordinarily) restricted access sites.

5. Maa ('935) is an Web TV set top box which differs from the independent claims in that there is no host engine on the server which provides the client with code that enables communication with the selected service. [See 2:55-58 and 7:15-8:30]

Information Regarding Communication with the PTO

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pinchus M. Laufer whose telephone number is (703) 306-4160. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, G. O. Hayes, can be reached on (703) 305-9711. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9051.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

May 4, 2000

Pinchus M. Laufer
Pinchus M. Laufer
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2766